

1 Garland T. Stephens, garland.stephens@weil.com
2 Douglas Wayne McClellan, *pro hac vice*,
doug.mcclellan@weil.com
3 Weil, Gotshal & Manges LLP
700 Louisiana, Suite 1700
Houston, TX 77002
4 Phone: 713-546-5000 / Fax: 713-224-9511

5 Jared Bobrow, SBN 133712, jared.bobrow@weil.com
6 Sonal N. Mehta, SBN 222086, sonal.mehta@weil.com
7 Weil, Gotshal & Manges LLP
201 Redwood Shores Parkway
Redwood Shores, CA 94065
Phone: 650-802-3000 / Fax: 650-802-3100

8 Brian E. Ferguson, *pro hac vice*, brian.ferguson@weil.com
9 Weil, Gotshal & Manges, LLP
1300 Eye Street NW, Suite 900
10 Washington, DC 20005-3314
Phone: 202-682-7077

11 Seth M. Sproul, SBN 217711, sproul@fr.com
12 Fish & Richardson P.C.
12390 El Camino Real
13 San Diego, CA 92130
Phone: 858-678-5070 / Fax: 858-678-5099

14 Thad C. Kodish, *pro hac vice*, tkodish@fr.com
15 Fish & Richardson P.C.
1180 Peachtree Street, N.E., Suite 2100
16 Atlanta, GA 30309
Phone: 404-892-5005 / Fax: 404-892-5002

17 Attorneys for Intervenor Intel Corporation

18 **REMAINING COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANTS AND**
19 **INTERVENORS LISTED ON SIGNATURE PAGES**

20 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
OAKLAND DIVISION

22 U.S. Ethernet Innovations, LLC,) Case No. 4:10-cv-03724-CW (LB)
Plaintiff,) Case No. 4:10-cv-05254-CW (LB)
23 vs.)
Acer, Inc., *et al.*,)
Defendants,)
Atheros Communications, Inc., *et al.*,)
Intervenors.)
26 AT&T Mobility, LLC, *et al.*,)
Defendants.)
27)
28)
Judge: Honorable Claudia Wilken
Place: Courtroom 2, 4th Floor
Date: August 14, 2014
Time: 2:00 p.m.

1 Pursuant to this Court's Order dated February 19, 2013 (Dkt. No. 691) and Local Rule 16-
 2 10(d), the Defendants and Intervenors in the above-referenced actions hereby submit this Case
 3 Management Statement.

4 **I. Defendants' and Intervenors' proposals for the remainder of the case development
 5 process**

6 In order to minimize the burden on the Court, the Defendants and Intervenors suggest that
 7 the Court schedule a case management conference shortly after the Court rules on dispositive
 8 motions and USEI reduces the number of its asserted claims as scheduled. The dispositive
 9 motions may significantly simplify the case, for example by reducing the number of patents
 10 and/or parties for trial. Further, pursuant to this Court's Order, USEI must elect no more than
 11 twenty (20) total claims with no more than twelve (12) claims per chipmaker within two weeks of
 12 this Court's rulings on the dispositive motions. Dkt. 1117-3 at 30:24-31:1 (Transcript of February
 13 27, 2014 Case Management Conference). USEI's elections may further reduce the number of
 14 patents and/or parties for trial. A case management conference shortly after these events will
 15 allow the remaining parties to propose a structure for trial to the Court and reduce or streamline
 16 the subsequent pretrial filings with the Court.

17 If the Court is inclined to decide the trial structure at this case management conference,
 18 Defendants and Intervenors propose that the trials be structured such that Intel's trial is first and
 19 on all issues. Trying Intel first would efficiently resolve the largest number of issues and
 20 potential monetary damages.

21 **II. Changes Since The Last Case Management Statement**

22 Pursuant to Local Rule 16-10(d), Defendants and Intervenors provide the following
 23 summary of changes since the last case management statement, filed on February 25, 2014.

24 **A. Decided Motions**

25 This Court decided on August 6, 2014 the AT&T Services, Inc. ("AT&T") motion
 26 requesting reconsideration of its previous stay request (Case 4:10-cv-05254, Dkt. 542) and
 27 ordered the stay of AT&T. As such, AT&T is not participating in this Case Management
 28 Conference Statement.

1 **B. Pending Motions**

2 **1. Motions Before Judge Wilken¹**

- 3 1. Intervenors' and Defendants' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment that USEI Cannot
4 Meet its Burden of Proof on Damages (Dkt. 1167-3).
- 5 2. Intervenors' and Defendants' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment of Non-
6 Infringement of the '313 Patent For All Accused Products (Dkt. 1167-3).
- 7 3. Intervenors' and Defendants' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment that the Intel
8 82593 Anticipates Claim 21 of the '872 Patent and Claims 9, 28, and 39 of the '094
9 Patent (Dkt. 1167-3).
- 10 4. Intervenors' and Defendants' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment that the SONIC
11 Prior Art Anticipates the Asserted Claims of the '872 and '094 Patents (Dkt. 1167-3).
- 12 5. Intervenors' and Defendants' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment that No Party
13 Infringes the '459 Patent (Dkt. 1167-3).
- 14 6. Intervenors' and Defendants' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment that Claim 1 of
15 the '459 Patent and Claim 13 of the '313 Patent are Indefinite (Dkt. 1167-3).
- 16 7. (Stayed) AT&T's Motion for Partial Summary Judgment that USEI Cannot Collect
17 Damages from AT&T (Dkt. 1167-3).
- 18 8. MSI's Motion for Partial Summary Judgment that Marvel is Not Liable for
19 Extraterritorial Sales Transacted by Non-Party MAPL (Dkt. 1167-3).
- 20 9. Apple's Motion for Partial Summary Judgment that Apple Does Not Infringe Claims
21 1, 9, 12, and 28 of the '094 Patent (Dkt. 1167-3).
- 22 10. Atheros' and Sigma's Motion for Partial Summary Judgment that Atheros Does Not
23 Infringe Claim 1 of the '313 Patent and that Sigma and AT&T do Not Infringe Claims
24 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 10, 13, 17, and 19 of the '313 Patent (Dkt. 1167-3).

25
26

¹ A summary of the consequences of the Defendants' motions for summary judgment is attached
27 as Defendants' Exhibit A.

11. Intervenors' and Defendants' Motion For Relief From Non-Dispositive Pretrial Order Of Magistrate Judge Regarding Waiver of Privilege by USEI (Dkt. 1193).
12. USEI's Motion for Summary Judgment of Infringement of Claim 21 of the '872 Patent Against Intervenor Intel Corporation's Accused Products and OEM Accused Products Incorporating Intel Chips (Dkt. 1133-3).
13. USEI's Motion for Summary Judgment to Preclude Intel From Asserting Any Equitable Defenses in this Action, Including Laches (Dkt. 1133-3).
14. USEI's Motion for Summary Judgment That the SONIC Reference Does Not Anticipate the Asserted Claims (Dkt. 1133-3).
15. USEI's Motion for Summary Judgment of No Inequitable Conduct (Dkt. 1133-3). Defendants and Intervenors have withdrawn their claim of inequitable conduct, so USEI's motion for summary judgment of no inequitable conduct is moot.

2. Motions Before Magistrate Judge Beeler

- Joint Discovery Dispute Letter Regarding USEI's Untimely Expert Report Supplementation (Dkt. 1191).

C. Discovery

Fact discovery closed on March 7, 2014, and expert discovery closed June 4, 2014.

Pursuant to the Court's Scheduling Order, the parties exchanged initial expert reports on April 25, 2014. Dkt. 691. USEI's infringement and damages experts were deposed on May 29-31, 2014 and June 10-11, 2014, respectively.

Nonetheless, in the middle of dispositive briefing, USEI attempted to serve at least 23 new “supplemental” and “corrected” expert reports, against 12 parties, comprising at least 300 pages containing new damages and infringement opinions with no reasonable justification. At least 100 pages of new infringement reports were written in response to Defendants’ and Intervenors’ July 15th dispositive motion filings. A Joint Discovery Dispute Letter is currently pending before Judge Beeler regarding these untimely reports, and a hearing was held on August 7, 2014. Dkt.

1 1191. Attached for the Court's convenience as Defendants' Exhibit B is the Joint Letter Briefing
 2 submitted to Judge Beeler on this issue. Dkt. 1191.

3 USEI's seeks to address multiple deficiencies through its proposed "supplemental"
 4 reports, including new positions on the doctrine of equivalents, section 112 equivalents, use, and
 5 infringement under new claim constructions raised for the first time by USEI's invalidity expert
 6 Dr. Conte. Defendants' relied on USEI's originally-served reports to file their summary judgment
 7 motions, and allowing new reports now will jeopardize the summary judgment proceeding.
 8 USEI's supplemental reports are untimely, not supported by good cause, lack a showing of
 9 diligence, and are highly prejudicial to Defendants. A Joint Discovery Dispute Letter is currently
 10 pending before Judge Beeler regarding these untimely reports,² and a hearing was held on August
 11 7, 2013. Dkt. 1191.

12 USEI offers no reasonable justification for the many new opinions in them. For example,
 13 USEI attempts to justify one of its belated supplements by arguing it was unaware of the
 14 Defendants' and Intervenors' argument that the Accused Features are unused. However, (1) this
 15 issue was briefed to the Court more than one year ago in summary judgment proceedings (Dkt.
 16 863), and (2) Intel responded to USEI's interrogatory request, stating that the feature accused of
 17 infringing the '459 patent "remained disabled and unused in all later versions of Intel's 100 Mbps
 18 drivers" (Intervenor Intel Corporation's Supplemental Objections and Responses to Plaintiff U.S.
 19 Ethernet Innovations, LLC's Interrogatory No. 1) and that "Intel does not infringe either the '872
 20 or '094 Patents at least because in 2002, Intel disabled the Transmit Threshold that USEI
 21 identifies in its infringement contentions." (Intervenor Intel Corporation's Supplemental
 22 Objections and Responses to Plaintiff U.S. Ethernet Innovations, LLC's Interrogatory No. 1).
 23 USEI cannot credibly argue that it was unaware of Defendants' and Intervenors' argument.

26 _____
 27 ² Attached for the Court's convenience as Defendants' Exhibit B is the Joint Letter Briefing
 28 submitted to Judge Beeler on this issue (Dkt. 1191)

1 Judge Beeler has also ordered USEI to produce its consultant, Bruce Sanders, for
 2 deposition (Dkt. 1130). His deposition will be taken on August 26, 2014 in Atlanta, Georgia per
 3 agreement of the parties.

4 **III. Related Cases**

5 **A. There were three related cases that have been resolved:**

- 6 1. 3COM Corporation v. D-Link Systems, Inc., U.S. District Court, Northern District of
 California, Case No. 3:03-cv-02177-VRW;
- 7 2. U.S. Ethernet Innovations, LLC v. Ricoh Americas Corporation, U.S. District Court,
 Eastern District of Texas, Case No. 6:12cv235; and
- 8 3. U.S. Ethernet Innovations, LLC v. STMicroelectronics N.V. et al., U.S. District Court,
 Eastern District of Texas, Case No. 6:12cv481.

9 **B. There are five related cases that are currently pending in this District:**

- 10 4. U.S. Ethernet Innovations, LLC v. Acer, Inc., et al., U.S. District Court, Northern
 District of California, Case No. 4:10-cv-03724-CW(LB);
- 11 5. Zions Bancorporation v. U.S. Ethernet Innovations LLC, U.S. District Court, Northern
 District of California, Case No. 4:10-cv-03481-CW(LB);
- 12 6. Apple Inc. v. Oracle America Inc., U.S. District Court, Northern District of California,
 Case No. 4:13-cv-05883-CW(LB); and
- 13 7. U.S. Ethernet Innovations, LLC v. AT&T Mobility, LLC, et al., U.S. District Court,
 Northern District of California, Case No. 4:10-cv-05254-CW(LB);
- 14 8. ASUSTeK Computer Inc. and ASUS Computer Int'l v. Silicon Integrated Systems
 Corp., U.S. District Court, Northern District of California, Case No. 4:13-cv-05882-
 CW.

15 **C. There are two related cases still pending in the Eastern District of Texas:**

- 16 9. U.S. Ethernet Innovations, LLC v. Lenovo (United States) Inc., U.S. District Court,
 Eastern District of Texas, Case No. 6:13cv612; and

1 10. U.S. Ethernet Innovations, LLC v. Texas Instruments Incorporated, U.S. District
 2 Court, Eastern District of Texas, Case No. 6:11cv491.

3 **IV. Scheduling**

4 The Court has established the following deadlines:

5 Deadline for Defendants and Intervenors to file their joint 6 reply in support of their dispositive motion, contained in a 7 single brief of fifteen pages or less.	Thursday, August 7, 2014
8 Case Management Statement due	Thursday, August 7, 2014
9 Hearing on dispositive motions and further case management 10 conference	Thursday, August 14, 2014 11 at 2:00 p.m.
10 Final pretrial conference	Wednesday, December 17, 11 2014, at 2:00 p.m.
12 Jury trial to begin	Monday, January 5, 2015, 13 at 8:30 a.m.

13 **V. Trial**

14 Each Intervenor requests a separate jury trial on issues triable by jury as of right.

15 DATED: August 7, 2014

WEIL, GOTSHAL & MANGES LLP

16 By: /s/ Garland T. Stephens

17 Garland T. Stephens, garland.stephens@weil.com
 18 Counsel for Intervenor INTEL CORPORATION

19 QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN LLP

20 By: /s/ Ray R. Zado

21 Ray R. Zado, rayzado@quinnemanuel.com
 22 Counsel for Intervenor Marvell Semiconductor, Inc.

23 REED SMITH LLP

24 By: /s/ Jonah D. Mitchell

25 Jonah D. Mitchell, jmitchell@reedsmit.com
 26 Counsel for Intervenor Atheros Communications, Inc.

27 TECKNOWLEDGE LAW GROUP LLP

28 By: /s/ Fatima Alloo

DEFENDANTS' AND INTERVENORS' CASE MANAGEMENT STATEMENT
 Case Nos. 4:10-cv-03724-C W(LB); 4:10-cv-05254 CW (LB)

1 WILLIAMS MORGAN, PC
2

3 By: /s/ Danny Williams
4 Danny Williams, danny@wmalaw.com
5 Counsel for Apple Inc.
6

7 COOLEY LLP
8

9 By: /s/ Lam Nguyen
10 Lam Nguyen, lnguyen@cooley.com
11 Counsel for ASUS Computer International and
12 ASUSTeK Computer Inc.
13

14 WINSTON & STRAWN
15 FARELLA BRAUN & MARTEL LLP
16

17 By: /s/ Kathleen B. Barry
18 Kathleen B. Barry, kbarry@winston.com
19 Counsel for Dell Inc.
20

21 MORRISON & FOERSTER
22

23 By: /s/ Daniel C. Hubin
24 Daniel C. Hubin, dhubin@mfo.com
25 Counsel for Fujitsu Limited and Fujitsu America, Inc.
26

27 K&L GATES LLP
28

29 By: /s/ Roderick B. Williams
30 Roderick B. Williams, rick.williams@klgates.com
31 Counsel for Hewlett Packard Co.
32

33 FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT &
34 DUNNER, LLP
35

36 By: /s/ Michael V. Young, Sr.
37 Michael V. Young, Sr., michael.young@finnegan.com
38 Counsel for Sony Corp., Sony Corp. of America and
39 Sony Electronics Inc.
40

41 KNOBBE MARTINS OLSON & BEAR LLP
42

43 By: /s/ Brian Claassen
44 Brian Claassen, brian.claassen@kmob.com
45 Counsel for Toshiba Corp., Toshiba America, Inc. and
46 Toshiba America Information Systems, Inc.
47

48 **AT&T DEFENDANTS:**
49

50 PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP
51

1 By:/s/ David A. Jakopin
2 David A. Jakopin, david.jakopin@pillsburylaw.com
3 Counsel for Intervenor Sigma Designs, Inc.
4

DECLARATION OF CONSENT

5 Pursuant to General Order No. 45, Section X(B) regarding signatures, I attest under
6 penalty of perjury that concurrence in the filing of this document has been obtained from the
7 parties hereto.

8 DATED: August 7, 2014

WEIL, GOTSHAL & MANGES LLP

9 By: /s/ Justin L. Constant
10 Justin L. Constant, justin.constant@weil.com

11 Counsel for Intervenor INTEL CORPORATION